

Each of these articles (two dealing with the US, one with Mexicans, and the last focusing on Brazil) has to do with the recovery of an indigenous population, in part, through self-identification and re-identification. Look for commonalities and contrasts.

**Hitt, Jack. 2005, August 21. "The Newest Indians." *The New York Times*.**

1. What struck you as being the journalist's primary outlook on those he interviewed? What are some key words and phrases from the article that substantiate your interpretation?
2. "I'm a completely new Indian," she said. "I have had to learn everything from the ground up, and I'm learning every day"—what is an "old Indian" then?
3. Is there a "new kind of ethnic unease" in Indian Country, or is it the reproduction of a much older set of racial constraints...or is there any difference between the two?
4. Far from extinction, there has been a surging increase in American Indian re-identification: is this phenomenon, from the journalist's point of view, casino-driven, a grab for cash?
5. From the point of view of some critics, "lifelong Indians" as Hitt calls them, is there any difference between a "wannabe," a "hobby Indian," and a "new Indian"?
6. What does Hitt identify as the source of this preoccupation with race, with appearance, and why is it ironic from a historical point of view?
7. We have read of the rejection of Cherokees who were deemed to be too "Black," too dark and thus not "true Cherokees." This article, however, now shows us a different set of anxieties, over the disavowal of whiteness by "white Cherokees" (as one example). What is the basis for this anxiety over whiteness, according to Hitt? What is your opinion?
8. What is the reason for conscious language revival among so many tribes (according to Hitt)?

**Garroutte, Eva Marie. 2003. *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America*. Berkeley, CA: University Of California Press. (Ch. 4, If You're Indian and You Know It (but Others Don't)—Self-Identification, 82-98, 186-190)**

1. You are Indian because you say you are—is that how self-identification as indigenous is being conceived by Garroutte?
2. These newly created communities of self-identified American Indians are not federally recognized. Given that fact, and that federal funds and other financial opportunities remain closed to them, it would seem that an instrumentalist interpretation of their motivations is not valid? Is this conclusion correct? What do their motivations appear to be?
3. The chapter presents a range of problems with self-identification—please list these.
4. If self-identification poses a challenge to tribal sovereignty, this chapter essentially asks: so what? What do you think of the arguments presented with respect to this question?
5. If self-identification and tribal boundary maintenance each poses problems, then what is the way out of this mess?

**Warren, Jonathan W. 2001. *Racial Revolutions: Antiracism and Indian Resurgence in Brazil*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. (Ch. 1, Posttraditional Indians, 5-33)**

1. This report on Brazil presents some remarkable similarities with the North American situation, where indigenous resurgence has rendered assertions of extinction to lose credibility. What are the main points of similarity?
2. Is the author's depiction of the posttraditional condition grounded in essentialist or processual understandings of indigeneity?
3. Looking back at the previous readings for this section, would the concept of "post-traditional" have helped you to better appreciate those who self-identify and re-identify as Indian in the US?

4. What makes the metaphor of “contact” valuable in Warren’s eyes?
  5. How has Indian identity been circumscribed in Brazil, and do you read this as being unique to Brazil?
  6. At the end of these readings, if you had to undertake a research project on contemporary indigeneity, what would you be looking at first?
-